DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 029 SP 020 288

AUTHOR Smith, David C.
TITLE The Content in Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Conference on the Future of Teacher Education: Needed Research and Practice (College Station, TX, May 4, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; Classroom Techniques; Cooperative Planning; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; *Program Improvement; Student Evaluation; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Education Programs; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Operation PROTEACH

ABSTRACT

In a discussion of revitalizing teacher preparation programs, the questions of what a beginning teacher should know and be able to do in order to function at a fully professional level were considered. A description is presented of Operation PROTEACH activities at the University of Florida in Gainesville. This operation was generated by several conferences attended by university faculty, teachers and school administrators, and representatives of the Florida State Department of Education. During these conferences the basic elements believed to be central to the development of a reconceptualized teacher preparation program were identified: (1) a rigorous and extensive general education; (2) a comprehensive subject-matter base; (3) knowledge of the societal milieu in which a teacher operates; (4) a foundational education including educational history and philosophy of education; (5) a generic pedagogical component providing a set of knowledge which would be appropriate to teachers regardless of level or subject matter; (6) a subject-specific pedagogical component appropriate to the age level of students and subject matter; and (7) a component dealing with knowledge and experiences of a laboratory nature. Task forces were established to review five functions essential to the teacher's role: diagnosis, instructional planning, instructional management, observation, and interpersonal relations. Task force reports are used in curricular and program planning for PROTEACH. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217029

THE CONTENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

David C. Smith, Dean
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Presentation to Conference on The Future of
Teacher Education: Needed Research and Practice
Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

May 4, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David C. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 288

THE CONTENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

David C. Smith, Dean
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

There are those who might suggest that by clear and direct inference, this paper constitutes an indictment of teacher preparation programs as we know them today. That inference is based upon the supposition that if current teacher preparation programs are inadequate in their content, they must be fatally flawed in some fundamental fashion.

Not so. Educators need not offer an apology for currently existing teacher preparation programs. Present programs, for the most part, have served our nation and our profession well. They have resulted in the preparation of a cadre of teachers that, in the main, have served our parents, our schools, and our nation well. Within the last half century, America's teachers have prepared individuals who have led our nation, contributed to major medical advances, and launched satellites and shuttles.

Teacher preparation programs have done especially well in view of the restrictions placed upon them. Teacher education programs enjoy (suffer is perhaps a better word) grossly inadequate funding, inadequate staff to support a truly clinical program, and facilities and support that, typically, hardly rank among the most lavish found on our campuses. But, perhaps, the greatest restriction of all has been that of inadequate, and in some cases even diminishing, time to prepare individuals to function as full-fledged professionals in an increasingly demanding field.

The inadequate funding available for teacher education programs has been compellingly documented (Peseau and Orr, 1980). They have documented that too frequently the cost of programs to prepare teachers is lower than the cost of programs for teachers to teach students. All too often, the formulas for funding programs in higher education support teacher preparation programs at a more frugal level than virtually any other programs on our college campuses.

The diminished time available for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers has been documented earlier (Smith and Street, 1980). A reduction in the time available for professional preparation during a parallel period of rising expectation for professional performance seems especially inconsistent and, perhaps, even irrational. It touches the heart of the problem faced by teacher educators today.

It is abundantly clear that there is great societal concern over the perceived inadequacy of teachers and teacher preparation. Evidence of that concern may be found in a variety of sources. On this matter, straws in the wind resemble branches in a tornado.

Many, perhaps, remember with vivid clarity the recent cover of Time proclaiming to all who had been taught to read that "teacher can't teach." But the shocking examples cited in the Time article dealt with virtual teacher illiteracy; it dealt less harshly, except by inference, with the inability of teachers to teach; and few ever posed the question as to how teachers could pass presumably rigorous courses offered by our colleagues in colleges of liberal arts and sciences. Network news specials painted a bleak picture of the ability of teachers to function effectively in classrooms. Newsweek followed with a

pessimistic portrayal of the teachers of our nation. Those of us who in the normal course of events are required to deal with legislators, at both state and national levels, recognize all too well that we do not fall in the category of the favored few.

Some of us have observed with concern the recent report published by the Southern Regional Education Board which calls for major action to presumably improve the quality of the teaching corps in the schools of our portion of the United States. In some cases, the recommendations are clear and explicit. Sadly enough, some of the recommendations appear simplistic and recall solutions which were not effective to similar problems faced in the 60s and offer little likelihood of being successful today. This report appears to have precipitated increasing disenchantment with teacher preparation programs, and the deliberations in a variety of state legislatures in our region confirm a substantial crisis of confidence in the preparation of the teachers who staff our schools.

Professional educators—all of us, not just teacher educators—have a vested interest in the outcome of the conflict yet to be waged on this issue. The diminution of programs of preparation surely and inexorably diminishes each teacher functioning in the classrooms of our states. But even so, teacher educators especially must openly and actively support the programs for the improvement of the professional preparation of our school teachers. Any argument or assertion that teacher preparation programs as we have known them for over half a century are perfect beyond any conception for their need for improvement, results in an argument that is neither credible nor acceptable. I, for one, am ready to acknowledge that there is much to be

done to improve the preparation of the teachers who shape the minds and alter the hearts of our most valued and valuable resource. We need the support of individuals who will help us acquire the resources necessary to accomplish our task at an increasingly demanding level.

Consider our critics; they need our help. All too often, those who are critical of teacher education have astonishingly little fundamental understanding of the essential components of teacher preparation programs, of their design, and of how they are intended to function. For example, I wonder how many of our critics who feel that we need more subject matter in teacher preparation programs understand that it is typical for the preparation programs for secondary school teachers to require between 75% to 83% of the coursework for their teacher preparation programs outside of a college of education. I wonder how many individuals understand that, in some cases, between 2/3s to 3/4s (Two-thirds to three-fourths) of a four-year program for the preparation of elementary school teachers is taken outside a college of education. Personally, I find that the unknowledgeable critics frequently have inaccurate and distorted views of what, in fact, constitutes teacher preparation programs. We can assist them, and perhaps ourselves, by trying to provide them with accurate information about the nature and scope of teacher preparation programs as we know them today. It might, perhaps, even be helpful for them to have some knowledge of the nature of teacher preparation programs as they existed 50 years ago.

Those professions that have made major gains in both social esteem and salary during the past half century have almost inevitably been those professions which have dramatically increased the qualifications required to practice their craft.

As we turn our attention more directly to the content of teacher preparation programs, it is essential that we reflect carefully on two essential questions. At this point, I am referring to teacher preparation programs as those programs which seek to escape the traditional boundaries or parameters placed upon teacher educators. I suggest that two fundamental questions are very much in order. Those questions are:

1. What should a beginning teacher know in order to function effectively for the majority of their career in the 21st century?

2. What should a beginning teacher be able to do to function at a fully professional level at the time of entry into the profession?

If our teacher preparation programs are designed with these essential questions in mind, I suggest that we may define the content of teacher preparation programs in a substantially different fashion than we have defined the content in the past. But more about this point a bit later.

In addition to the essential questions of what should a beginning teacher know and what should a beginning teacher be able to do—what is the state of the art of the knowledge associated with teaching and learning?

A strong case can be made that the social science research literature associated with teaching and learning is better, more consistent, and reliable than we have ever known before. Unfortunately, far too little of that knowledge base appears to be in the process of being incorporated into the preservice preparation

programs of teachers. There is simply not adequate time available in existing programs to sufficiently absorb the content which needs to be incorporated into preparation programs. The literature to which I refer has been discussed and described by B. O. Smith, MacDonald, Denemark, and others. Fragments of that knowledge are known to most, if not all of us. But, it should be acknowledged that a comprehensive review of the full scope of contemporary social science dealing with teaching and learning is difficult to acquire.

At the University of Florida, we have been working on the question of teacher education content appropriate to a reconceptualized program since March, 1980. We have been trying to develop a reconceptualized program based upon the best, most consistent, and reliable knowledge available. In those cases where the research knowledge base is inadequate, or appears inadequate, we have relied upon the best available conventional wisdom.

It may be helpful, at this point, to briefly describe our PROTEACH activities in the College of Education.

Prior to committing ourselves to the design of a reconceptualized teacher preparation program, individual meetings were held with key state figures. In the vast majority of cases, those individuals supported our effort in the need to extend the preparation of teachers. After it was established that we appeared to have a sufficient support base within the state to attempt this task, meetings were held with faculty. These meetings appeared to indicate that sufficient support existed within the college to embark upon our effort.

Shortly after the determination that we did want to try to engage in the development of a reconceptualized teacher preparation program, we held our PROTEACH I Conference. At the conference, we brought together the faculty of our college and an approximate equal number of practitioners from throughout the state: urban and rural teachers, principals, superintendents, representatives of the Department of Education, and others. The primary purpose of the meeting was to address the two essential questions which I described earlier. You may recall that those questions were: What should a beginning teacher know and what should a beginning teacher be able to do? The questions were addressed in an extraordinarily constructive fashion by faculty and practitioners alike and that effort was extremely useful as we set about our task.

Following our PROTEACH I Conference, we held our PROTEACH II Conference. The purpose of this conference was essentially to draw together our faculty, supplemented by knowledgeable individuals with an understanding of major national activities in teacher preparation to serve as resource persons. These individuals were very helpful in describing portions of research literature, discussing the national climate for change in teacher education, and in helping us get a better grasp of the scene beyond the State of Florida.

During that general interval, we formed a Steering Committee composed of representative faculty and members of the College Administration to help us chart our course through a long and difficult labyrinth. The Steering Committee has members of the faculty from our Department of Subject Specialization Teacher Education (secondary education), from our General

Teacher Education Department (elementary education), our Department of Foundations of Education, the Director of Planning and Development for the college, a member of the faculty from our Instructional Leadership and Support Department, the Assistant and Associate Deans of the college, and the Dean of the college, who is chair.

We also have a Planning Committee which meets less often and reviews the overall progress of our PROTEACH effort. The Planning Committee is composed of the members of the Steering Committee, and, in addition, has representative faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the College of Fine Arts; the College of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; the College of Agriculture; representatives of the practicing school community (both teachers and administrators); and representatives of the State Department of Education. That group has been helpful and, on occasion, constructively critical. The purpose of the committee is to review the activity of PROTEACH to date and to make suggestions for mid-course corrections as we proceed with our redesign effort. Finally, and probably most important, a set of faculty committees has developed a series of invaluable materials and statements which we have used internally to try to describe the elements of the program as they appear to take shape.

It may also be helpful to describe some of the materials which we have felt essential in the development of a redesign teacher preparation program. Those materials which we have developed include:

a. a statement of the assumptions which appear to support and undergird a reconceptualized program;
b. a planning document designed to help us proceed in a thoughtful and orderly manner;

c. our PROTEACH I conference report;

d. our PROTEACH II conference report;

e. a brief paper on the nature of knowledge which deals with a description of the knowledge which appears appropriate to a redesign of our teacher preparation program;

f. Steering Committee minutes and other internal documents; and

g. the reports of various task forces and other committees.

The reports of the Task Forces and Committees are probably the most comprehensive and central set of documents describing the knowledge which we believe needs to be incorporated, at this point, into a reconceptualized teacher education program.

Following this brief description of the activities in which we have been engaged and materials which we have developed, it would probably be helpful to describe the basic elements which we believe to be central to the development of a reconceptualized teacher preparation program. Insofar as possible, we attempted to use existing terms and commonly accepted descriptions and definitions of elements of teacher education programs. We felt that communication among ourselves and others would be hampered by trying to describe, in unique or novel ways, elements of programs in terms that are inconsistent with current practice. I should also indicate that, even though the labels may be consistent with current practice, the scope of the knowledge which we might include in those components may go beyond what is currently possible, given the restrictions which many teacher preparation programs encounter. At any rate, let me try to enumerate them and describe them very briefly.

We believe that it is essential that a reconceptualized teacher education program contain a rigorous and extensive general education component. We believe that the nature of our society and the expectations for a professional teacher demand that these individuals be broadly educated and that they be genuinely able to serve as exemplars to the youth whom they teach. In like manner, we regard a comprehensive and demanding subject-matter knowledge base as central to the preparation of teachers. Teachers should have a clear command of their subject matter well beyond any levels expected of their students. The burgeoning rate with which man is acquiring new knowledge makes this expectation more important than it may have ever been before.

We expect to require a pre-education component within our reconceptualized program. In our view, a pre-education component deals with the set of knowledge appropriate to an individual serving as a teacher that would provide a better understanding of the societal milieu in which they are likely to function. In all likelihood, such a requirement will include the areas of urban sociology, rural sociology, cultural anthropology, social psychology, and general psychology. We would regard this component as essential for teachers, regardless of the level at which they will function or the subject matter areas for which they may be responsible as teachers.

A foundational education component is expected to be an important element within our program. The foundational educational component may include educational psychology, tests and measurements, brief general background on the history and philosophy of education, and perhaps, other related areas.

At the present time, we are working to describe what we term the generic pedagogical component. This component deals with a set of knowledge which would be appropriate to teachers regardless of the level or subject matter they teach. I will discuss that element in more detail later.

We also envision the requirement of the subject-specific pedagogical component. This component deals with a specific pedagogical content appropriate to the age level of students being taught or to the subject matter for which the teacher is responsible. Special methods would be included in this category, as might specific content associated with the developmental level of the learner.

We also have a committee at work on the task of designing our clinical and laboratory component. This component deals with the knowledge and the experiences of a laboratory nature, with which we expect to provide students prior to the time they begin clinical practice, and to describe the length and nature of the internship for student teaching.

I have now described the seven basic areas of our reconceptualized teacher preparation program. You will recognize that these areas are not a dramatic departure in large measure from the content of programs with which you may be familiar. The best way to get a sense of what we are trying to accomplish would be to examine the specific content for each of the components as they take shape.

We have made special efforts to describe the knowledge base associated with the generic pedagogical component. The elements of this component were

developed with care after an analysis of what practitioners and faculty alike appeared to report on what a beginning teacher should know and be able to do in terms of our review of a number of major studies of national scope of teacher preparation.

At this point, let me simply enumerate the components which we developed and then discuss each one of them briefly as a portion of the content associated with the generic component of a reconceptualized teacher preparation program.

First, we considered a teacher functioning in the role of teacher (teacher as a teacher). Five categories appeared to be central to that role; they were:

1. diagnosis
2. instructional planning
3. instructional management
4. observation
5. interpersonal relations

We then established second and third elements of the generic pedagogical component: teacher as a person, and teacher as a professional. Let me review each component and describe the information we are using at the present time as the basis for the development of our generic pedagogical component.

Diagnosis

The Task Force on Diagnosis reported that "An effective teacher must be a highly skilled diagnostician." The primary focus of the report of this task force was limited to the use of tests and other measurement instruments. The

diagnosis of student behavior was incorporated in a separate report of the Task Force on Instructional Management, which I will discuss momentarily. In addition, the diagnoses required for planning learning experiences or diagnosing learning experiences in specialized areas will be dealt with by the respective specialized task forces; that is to say, mathematics education or early childhood education were dealt with by specialized task forces rather than the Task Force on Generic Teaching Performance. Since reading is a concern in all subject areas at every grade level, some diagnostic procedures relating to reading were included in the report of the Task Force on Diagnosis.

> The most efficient, valid and reliable methods for assessing student behavior are grounded in a rich body of empirical research and demonstration studies. On the other hand, the uses of diagnostic information by classroom teachers have been, and will continue to be, determined by conventional wisdom or by current pedagogical theory, instructional philosophy, societal expectations, and even legislative requirements (e.g., PL 94-142). It seems crucial to prepare today's teacher in both technical aspects of diagnosis and the utilitarian aspects. To restrict instruction in diagnosis to only the first category would leave the beginning teacher ill-prepared to deal with the realities of classroom life and the decisions that he/she must make on a daily basis. . . We think that it would be vital to teach preservice teachers to make the distinction between these different types of concepts in a diagnosis. We point out that there is no such thing as "enduring truth' in a dynamic area like educational diagnosis. Even empirical evidence may shift over time as student populations and assessment practices change. It would be folly for a curriculum committee to try to spell out in detail what diagnostic concept should be included (or excluded) from professional curriculum.

What do perspective teachers need to know about diagnosis? We have concluded that there are five major areas in which teachers should have professional

diagnostic training. These areas include the following:

1. The role of diagnosis in educational evaluation and decision making
   a. What types of evaluation must teachers make?
   b. What is the role of diagnosis in educational evaluations?
   c. What models for diagnosis and evaluation are use for education?
   d. How can these models be applied in teaching settings?
2. Diagnosis of individual learner needs
   a. What types of information does the teacher need to make decisions?
   b. What methods are useful for diagnosis (including classroom and standardized tests as well as more informal procedures)?
   c. What skills and concepts do teachers need to judge the quality of diagnostic procedures and the accuracy of the information they yield?
   d. What skills do teachers need to interpret results of diagnostic procedures?
3. Diagnosis for group instructional needs
   a. What types of information are needed to determine that the group is meeting instructional goals?
   b. What methods should be used to gather such information?
   c. What skills do teachers need to interpret results of these diagnostic procedures?
   d. What skills do teachers need to assess the quality of this information?
4. Diagnosis in special subject areas
   a. What are the diagnostic needs which every teacher needs?
   b. What does every teacher need to know about selecting, evaluating, and administering standardized diagnostic tests?

c. What does every teacher need to know about interpretation of diagnostic test results for use in instructional planning?

5. Diagnosis for specific exceptionalities

   a. What diagnostic skills and knowledge does every teacher need to identify children who were not referred for specialized diagnostic procedures?

   b. How should the typical classroom teacher interpret and use the results of diagnostic tests in instructional planning for the exceptional child in the normal classroom?

The Task Force on Diagnosis emphasized that these illustrative concepts, behaviors, and references constitute only the "tip of the iceberg" for the knowledge areas represented and it hopes that future planning committees who use these materials will keep that in mind at all times.

In dealing with the elements of diagnosis just described, the Steering Committee selected knowledge areas, concepts, behavioral indicators, and illustrative sources for each, in order to assist subsequent committees for task forces in the development of components for our instructional program.

A second task force, the Task Force on Instructional Planning, dealt with instructional planning. It defined the process as that used by teachers in deciding what and how to teach. The task force accepted a widely recognized "planning model" which prescribed four elements in the sequence of planning:

1. precise specification of objectives
2. assessment of the entry behavior of students
3. the design and implementation of an instructional sequence
4. evaluation

The task force acknowledged that the simplicity and logic of such a rational model appealed to many theorists.

In its review of research on teacher planning, the task force gave major emphasis to two aspects which were regarded as important to beginning teachers—the content of the teacher plans and the process of teaching planning. Research pertaining to each of these areas was reviewed within the task force report. The report concluded that "When teachers plan, they plan about: objectives, the content to be taught, learning activities, time for instruction, and the methods of evaluating the lesson or the instructional plan." This report discussed research in each of these areas. While time does not permit the discussion of the summary of the research in detail, suffice it to indicate that the task force report does deal with those data in some detail.

I would like to call your attention to a description of instruction format developed by the Florida Beginning Teacher Program Coalition for the Development of a Performance Evaluation System. This effort has been coordinated through the Office of Teacher Education, Certification, and Staff Development of the State Department of Education in Tallahassee, Florida. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the particular efforts of Dr. B. O. Smith in supporting the work of that coalition. In their consideration of instruction format, specific attention was given to the total group/lecture, the total group/lecture discussion, the total group/recitation, the total group/interaction, the total group/independent work, subgroup/disparate work, and lesson type.

I should also report that the coalition also considered in detail the management of subject matter; included was the management of conceptual knowledge, explanatory knowledge, content levels, discourse, and emphasis.

I should also call your attention to a review of research of teachers' pedagogical judgment plans and decisions developed by Shavelson, the Rand Corporation, and UCLA, with the support of the National Institute for Education. This review focused upon teachers' judgment, planning, and interactive decision-making, and contains an extensive set of annotated references.

All of these sources of information, and others, are being utilized in the development of our generic knowledge-base component for teacher preparation.

A third task force, the Task Force on Instructional Management, dealt with instructional management. The task force interpreted the area of their review to include "all of those activities of the teacher that occurred during the conduct of the instruction in the classroom within the domain of what might be called strategies, method, and methods of techniques of instruction." The task force report was divided into the areas of direct instruction, physical environment in the use of space, individualized instruction, instructional resources in the classroom and community, small group instruction, team teaching, and classroom management. For example, in the area of direct instruction, four specific sub-areas were considered:

1. direct instruction
2. engaged time; time on task
3. teachers' questioning behavior
4. teacher efficacy

Quoting from the task force report, "In the last five to ten years, the profession of education has witnessed the emergence of an increasingly firm consensus among researchers and practicioners about their relationships between teacher behaviors and the academic achievements of students in their classes." Specific new insights have developed in relation to such factors as the importance of "time on task" as a specific factor in improving student achievement. The importance of structured classroom management behaviors in the presence of low, negative teacher affect is clear. Again from the task force report, "Patterns of instruction associated with what has come to be called 'direct instruction' seemed correlated with successful efforts to improve student achievement in standardized tests of basic skills." This section of the Task Force Report on Instructional Management sampled some of the more important areas of that consensus. In the presentation of the task force report, the concepts important to beginning teachers were identified, defined, indicators presented, and sources of information provided. This format was consistently followed throughout the Task Force Report on Instructional Management. It provides a data-based set of concepts useful and appropriate for beginning teachers.

I would also like to report the development of a description of the management of class time done by the Florida Beginning Teacher Program Coalition for the Development of a Performance Evaluation System through the Office of Teacher Education, Certification, and Staff Development in the Department of Education. This effort, too, was assisted through the insight and expertise of Dr. B. O. Smith. It provides a highly structured and organized description of the set of skills which are essential for beginning teachers if they are to manage class time effectively.

I would also call your attention to a paper developed by Jere Brophy on classroom organization and management, which was supported by the Institute for Research on Teaching in the College of Education at Michigan State University and funded by the National Institute for Education for a conference held this year at Arlie House in Warrington, Virginia. Here again, all of these data are being considered and incorporated into a generic component for the preparation of beginning teachers.

In like manner, I could continue with reports of the Task Forces on Observation, Interpersonal Relations, Teacher as a Person, and Teacher as a Professional, but I do not want to be tedious. Rather, I shall cite sources for the information to which I refer in this paper. The entire set of task force reports, plus recently developed information which parallels but does not duplicate the effort of our faculty, are being incorporated into the design of the generic component for the preparation of beginning teachers.

I should acknowledge that I am painfully aware that I have not attempted to deal in substantive fashion with other important areas of a teacher preparation program, including the clinical component, the subject specific component, a pre-education component, the nature of a general education component appropriate to the preparation of teachers, and the subject matter component for teachers in a variety of teaching fields. All of this represents necessary and difficult work, but clearly exceeds the scope of the paper which I am presenting to you today.

At this point, let me simply acknowledge that the stakes for the extension of

preparation programs for beginning teachers are terribly high, and that teachers will never realize genuine professional status until the preparation programs represent a genuinely respectable body of professional knowledge. It's very hard work but, in all candor, I believe that the greater risk is in not pursuing our goal. Business as usual is simply not an acceptable alternative.

5/82

Brophy, J.E. Advance in teacher effectiveness research. In Progress Report: Advance During the Past Year in the Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, 1978.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Planning Document. Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1981.

College of Education, University of Florida. Conference on Operation PROTEACH, Report No. I. Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Conference on Operation PROTEACH, Report No. II. Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force IA, "Diagnosis." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force IB, "Instructional Planning." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force I C, "Instructional Management." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force I D "Observation." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force IE, "Interpersonal Relations." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

College of Education, University of Florida. Operation PROTEACH: Report of Task Force III, "The Teacher as a Professional." Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1980.

Cremin, L.A. The education of the educating professions. 19th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture, Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Denemark, G. & Nutter, N. The case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1980.

Guenther, J. (chair). Professional teacher preparation program. An unpublished committee report, Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas, 1980.

Help! Teacher can't teach. Time., June 16, 1980, pp. 54-63.

McDonald, F.J. & Elias, P. Problems of beginning teachers and fifth-year programs. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1982.

McDonald, F.J. The teacher internship and teacher induction. Paper presented to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Boston, 1980.

Medley, D. A professional examination for teachers. Paper prepared for the Policy Council of the National Teacher Examinations (NIE), Morgantown, West Virginia, 1981.

Smith, B.O. A design for a school of pedagogy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Smith, B.O. Domains of teacher performance. Unpublished manuscript, 1981. (Available from College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida).